University of SC Lancaster

Sector: Two-Year Institutions -Branches of the Univ of SC

1999-2000 Performance Year Score

85%

2.55 out of a Maximum of 3.00

ACHIEVES STANDARDS

See Interpreting Scores at bottom of page

Performance Score Summary

Total Applicable Indicators (incl. 2 now assessed within other indicators.)

Exceeded Standards (or received scores of 3) on

Achieved Standards (or received scores of 2.00-2.99) on

Did Not Achieve Standards (or received scores of 1.00-1.99) on

Achieved Compliance (or received scores of "Complied") on

Evaluated in Years Other Than Performance Year 1999-00

30 Indicators

11 Indicators

2 Indicators

3 Indicators

6 Indicators

USC Lancaster At A Glance

Joseph Pappin, III, Dean 476 Hubbard Drive PO Box 889 Lancaster, SC 29720 (803) 285-7471 www.sc.edu/lancaster

Founded in 1959
For link to institution's mission, see www.che400.state.sc.us and select "Performance Funding"



Enrollment

SAT

Headcount includes full and part time 1,010 1,00% of headcnt Undergraduate 1,010 1,0

16% of headcnt Minority

Full-Time 422 (42% of headcnt)

892 (1st-time entering freshmen,

Average incl. converted ACT scores)

Degrees
Awarded 106 Associates
FY 1998-99

Full-Time Faculty

27 incl. those holding academic rank & primary assignment of instruction, research or public service. (IPEDS)

Tuition \$2,100 In State, Full-Time Student
Academic Year \$5,198 Out of State, Full-Time Student
1999-00 (incl. required tuition and fees,

(incl. required tuition and fees, IPEDS Inst. Characteristics Survey)

Financial \$5.4 Total Revenue, excl. auxiliary
Dollars In Millions \$5.7 Total Educ. & General Expend.

FY 1998-99 excl. auxiliary (IPEDS Finance Survey)

(Fall 1999 data unless noted otherwise)

Interpreting Scores

Comparing the average score on applicable indicators to the maximum 3.00 possible produces the percentage score shown in the upper right hand column. Institutions within the same sector whose percentage is in the same range as shown below are considered to to be performing at similar levels.

If Percent or Overall Score Range is:	Performance Category is:						
95% to 100% or 2.85 to 3.00	Substantially Exceeds						
87% to 94% or 2.60 to 2.84	Exceeds						
67% to 86% or 2.00 to 2.59	Achieves						
48% to 66% or 1.45 to 1.99	Does Not Achieve						
33% to 47% or 1.00 to 1.44	Substantially Does Not Achieve						

SC Commission on Higher Education's Ratings for the 1999-00 Performance Year to impact Fiscal Year 2000-01 Approved May 4, 2000. Report prepared by the Commission's Division of Planning, Assessment & Perf. Funding 1333 Main St., Suite 200 * Columbia, SC 29201 * (803) 737-2260 * www.che400.state.sc.us

PERFORMANCE FUNDING IN SC: "Performance Funding" began in SC with the ratification of Act 359 of 1996, effective July 1, 1996. Act 359 required that the State's coordinating board for higher education (SC Commission on Higher Education or "CHE") measure annually each public institution's performance in various areas and base allocation of state appropriated dollars on performance. A 3-year, phase-in period was provided for CHE to design a system that translated indicators specified in legislation to measures and to provide a process translating performance to dollars. CHE worked with the business and higher education communities to design the current system which has evolved since its inital conceptualization. During the phase-in period as the system and indicators were defined, only selected indicators were used to determine a percentage of dollars received. Last year, CHE determined each institution's allocation for FY 1999-00 based on performance. The system continues to undergo refinements as measures and data are better understood. In the years ahead, standards set for SC's institutions will continue to increase in an effort to ensure and improve the quality of SC's public institutions of higher education so they will be globally competitive.

For the 1999-00 performance year, the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) rated each institution's performance on a set of measures approved by the CHE. Scores of 1 to 3 were awarded for performance on indicators or indicator subparts based on standards set last spring. Some standards were set by institutions and approved by CHE while others were set by CHE and were the same for all institutions. CHE, in limited cases, scored performance based on institutional appeals during the scoring process.

The range required for an institution to receive a score of 2 is shown below. Because of the method used to set standards, this range varies across indicators and institutions. Indicators where CHE considered an appeal and awarded scores based on that appeal rather than the range are noted. Applicable indicators for an institution depend on the institution's sector mission and individual characteristics as indicators are defined similarly for all institutions. To determine the overall score, the scores on applicable indicators are averaged. For indicators with multiple subparts, the subparts are scored and then averaged together to produce a single indicator score that contributes to the overall score. If the score for an indicator or subpart is:

- 3 The institution "Exceeds" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions or is at or above a standard identified to indicate a level beyond which continuous improvement is not expected.
- 2 The institution "Achieves" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions as indicated by the ranges shown below.
- 1 The institution "Does Not Achieve" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions.

Indicators Requiring Compliance - Some indicators require that an institution comply with a set of practices or policies. If an institution is in compliance the performance is scored "Complied" and no numeric score contributes to the final average. If an institution fails to comply, the institution receives a score of 1 for noncompliance. Indicators "On Cycle" - Some indicators are assessed at two or three year intervals.

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number /		(Time Period	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		1999-00 Performance Score		
)escr	escriptive Measurement Title		Measured This Yr)	Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	(1 if below (3 if above this #) this #)	E S	Subpart	Indicator
	1A	Funds expended to achieve mission based on ratio of expenditure category to total educational and general expenditures. Expend. Category is "Instruction"	(FY 98-99)	49.9%	44.1%	48.7% to 51.7%			1.00
MISSION FOCUS	1B	Curricula offered to achieve mission measured as the % of programs appropriate to degree level, supported by mission, & with full approval in most recent CHE program review.	(Spring 2000)	Not Avail	100%	95% to 99% or not more than one not approved			3.00
VISSIO	1C	Approval of a mission statement. CHE approves once every 5 years with changes being assessed in the interim.	(initial '98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied
	1D	Adoption of a strategic plan.	(FY 98-99)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied
	1E	Attainment of strategic plan goals.	(FY 97-98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied
	2A	Academic and other credentials of professors and ins	tructors :						3.00
		% headcount faculty teaching undergrads meeting Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools requirements	(Fall 1999)	100.0%	100.0%	97.0% to 99.9%	(2)	3	
LTY		2a % headcount faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses.	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	N/A, Compliance measures for this year only (new measure		Complied	
QUALITY OF FACULTY		2b % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	that required collection of data during this year)		Complied	
OF.	2B	Faculty performance review system. Assessed every 3 years.		100%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.			On Cycle
٩LITΥ	2C	Faculty post tenure review system. Assessed every 3 years.		100%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.			On Cycle
30/	2D	Average faculty compensation by rank :							2.50
		1a Instructor	(Fall 1999)	\$36,819	\$34,420	\$31,749 to \$32,069	(2)	3	
		1b Assistant Professor	(Fall 1999)	n < 2	\$36,359	\$33,384 to \$37,515	(2)	2	
		1c Associate Professor	(Fall 1999)	\$44,393	\$48,228	\$45,268 to \$46,182	(2)	3	
		1d Professor	(Fall 1999)	\$54,722	\$55,993	\$55,800 to \$56,928	(2)	2	

NOTES:

- (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.
- (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 2A1=100%; 2D1a=\$32,070; 2D1b=\$41,730; 2D1c=\$50,642; and 2D1d=\$62,864

USC Lancaster Performance Year 1999-00

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title		(Time Period	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O	1999-00 Performance Score				
		Measured This Yr)	Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	(I if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator			
	2E	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom as based on standard survey questions:										
QUALITY OF FACULTY (con't)		1 % classroom faculty rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.		100%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	•		On Cycle			
UALI ULTY		2 % advisors rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.		83%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	•		On Cycle			
AΩ	2F	Community and public service activities of faculty for incorporated into the measurement of Indicator 2B.	which no ex	hich no extra compensation is paid. This measure has been								
	зА	Class size and student /teacher ratios : (Expected Ranges for 3A)								3.00		
		1a lower division class size	(Fall 1999)	18.1	18.8	15 to	25					
		1b upper division class size	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	o N/A		in range			
		2a % undergrad lecture sections of 50 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.0%	0% to	20%					
		2b % lower division lecture of 100 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.0%	0% to	5%		in range			
_		3 FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	(Fall 1999)	14.0	15.7	14 to	19		in range			
CLASSROOM QUALITY	3B	Average # credit hours taught by full-time faculty teaching at least 3 hours.	(Fall 1999)	204	241	198 to	210	(2)		3.00		
٤	3C	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees.	(Fall 1999)	41.8%	41.5%	38.9% to		(2)		3.00		
Ş	3D	Accreditation of degree granting programs.	(Spring 2000)	100%	100%	90% to 99%	6 or all but 1 gram	(3)		3.00		
2	3E	Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education a	/			prog	jium			N/A		
לב		1 NCATE accreditation	(Spring 2000)	N/A	N/A	N	/A		N/A			
		% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Professional Knowledge	(4/1/98 -	N/A	N/A	N/A to	o N/A		N/A			
		2b % students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Specialty Area Exams	3/31/99) (4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	o N/A		N/A			
		3a % teacher ed. grads in critical shortage areas	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	n/A		N/A			
		3b % teacher ed. grads who are minority	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	o N/A		N/A			
OLLABORATION	4A	Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and/or with the business community. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	•			On Cycle		
COLLA	4B	Cooperation and collaboration with private industry. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	ed this year. in Spring 2002.			On Cycle		
	5A	Ratio of administrative expenditures to academic expenditures, expressed as a %.	(FY 98-99)	13.5%	27.0%	32.7% to	31.8%	(1) (2)		3.00		
EFFICIENCY	5B	Use of best management practices measured by extent of incorporation of identified best practices. Assessed every 2 years.		100%	On Cycle	Not assesse Assessed next	•			On Cycle		
EFFIC	5C	Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs. Assessed every 3 years.	(FY 99-00)	Complied	Complied		ce required or a s awarded.			Complied		
	5D	General overhead expenditures per full-time equivalent student.	(FY 98-99)	\$624	\$1,337	\$1,158 to	\$1,125	(1) (2)		1.00		
TS	6A	SAT scores of entering freshmen, % with 1000 SAT/20 ACT or higher.	(Fall 1999)	24.6%	27.3%	24.0% to	25.4%	(2)		3.00		
MEN	6B	% entering freshmen with high school rank in top 30% or 3.0 GPA or higher on a 4.0 scale.	(Fall 1999)	42.5%	49.2%	41.3% to	43.9%	(2)		3.00		
EQUIREMENTS	6C	Policy for considering post-secondary non- academic achievements of non-traditional students, compliance with CHE guidelines.	(as of Spring 2000)	Complied	Complied		ce required or a s awarded.		0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	Complied		
2	6D	Priority on enrolling in-state students, based on those considered in-state for fee purposes.	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A		
OT!		(1) A downward trend is expected. If performance	is lawer than	the level are		/44	-f) :I			

NOTES: See last page for notes after

(3).

⁽¹⁾ A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

⁽²⁾ A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 3B=260*; 3C=40.1%; 5A=31.7%; 5D=\$1,124; 6A=33.3%; 6B=60%* (* temporary level approved for current year)

⁽³⁾ Percentage reflects both programs accredited and on track for accreditation to be awarded by April 2002.

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title		(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"			1999-00 Performance Score		
			Prior Yr This Yr '98-99 '99-00		(I if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	Ţ	Subpart	Indicator	
	7A	Graduation rate :								1.00
		1 150% of program time, considers 1st-time, full-time, degree-seeking students.	1996 cohort	33.9%	21.5%	33.0% to	35.0%		1	
		 150% of program time, excluding those enrolled in 2 or more developmental courses 1st semester (applies to Tech Colleges only). 	same cohort as 7A1	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A	
Ì	7B	Employment and education rate for graduates (Asses	ssed every 2	years) :						Complied
ENTS		system for tracking undergraduates on employment or continued education with response rate of 20%		Not Avail	Complied	N/A, compliance score of 1 is a			Complied	
GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS		2 % graduates either employed or enrolled at a more advanced level		Not Avail	On Cycle	Not assessed w collected. Will b with part 1 eve	e assessed		On Cycle	
ACH		3 % graduates employed within 1 year		Not Avail	On Cycle	starting with Perfo	rmance Year		On Cycle	
ES.	7C	Employer feedback on graduates (Assessed every 2	years) :							N/A
UAT		process for surveying employers who interview or hire prospective graduates		N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
GRAE		employers' level of satisfaction with graduates interviewed		N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
		3 employers' satisfaction with employees		N/A	N/A				N/A	
	7D	% of students passing professional examinations.	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	100.0%	100.0%	92.2% to	97.9%			3.00
	7E	Number of graduates continuing their education. This		as been inco	prporated int	to the measuremen	t of Indicator 7	'B.		ı
	7F	Average credit hours earned compared to average required for program completed of students earning bachelor's degrees.	(Degrees earned in 1998-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A
	8A	Transferability of credits to and from the institution (extent of compliance with CHE guidelines)	(Spring 2000)	100%	100%	97% to	99%	(2)		3.00
	8B	Continuing education programs for graduates and others measured as total CEU's produced in FY. Applicable if CEU production >= 1000.	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A
임	8C	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state	e :							2.33
INSTITUTION		who are minority (neadcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	16.6%	17.4% to	18.4%	(2)	1	
Z		undergrads who are minority.	(Fall '98 to Fall '99)	Not Avail	54.5%	50.0% to	53.0%	(2)	3	
		(neadcount)	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A		N/A	
		4 % teaching faculty who are minority (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	7.1%	4.4% to	4.6%		3	
FUNDING	9A	Financial support for reform in teacher education measured as FY research expenditures for teacher education compared to most recent 3-yr average.	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A
FUNDING	9B	Public and private sector grants measured as FY restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-yr Average. (Applicable if >= \$1 million in annual expenditures)	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A to	N/A			N/A
Summary	Based on data in the far right column, "1999-00 Performance S Applicable Indicators 30 (including two that are assessed w Exceeded standards (scores of 3) on 11 indicators.				ndicators).	Subtotal : # of indicators averaged			40.83 16	
Summai		Achieved Standards (scores of 2.00 to 2.99) on 2 Did Not Achieve Standards (scores of 1.00 to 1.9 Achieved Compliance on 6 indicators. 6 indicator	2 indicators 99) on 3 in	dicators.			Average: e / 3.00 Max: Category is		2.55 85% ACHIEVES	

NOTES: (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

⁽²⁾ A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 8A=100%; 8C1=27.1%; and 8C2=60%* (* temporary level approved for current year)